R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 951 UD 000 771

FOR EVERY CHILD, THE STORY OF INTEGRATION IN THE PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, PA.

PUB DATE OCT 60

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80 18P.

DESCRIPTORS- *BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, *RACIAL BALANCE, *PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS, *URBAN SCHOOLS, SCHOOL INTEGRATION, TEACHER PLACEMENT, HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAMS, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, SCHOOL COMMUNITY PROGRAMS, SCHOOL BUILDINGS, SPECIAL SERVICES, SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHY, RACIAL DISTRIBUTION, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, TABLES (DATA), PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

THE PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION REPORTS ON THE STATUS OF RACIAL BALANCE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AS WELL AS ON THE SCHOOL SYSTEM'S PROGRESS TOWARD INTEGRATION. THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALL THE SCHOOLS, EMPLOYEE ASSIGNMENT POLICIES, AND SCHOOL SUPPLIES AND BUILDING CONDITIONS ARE DISCUSSED. ORGANIZED HUMAN RELATIONS EMPHASES WERE INTRODUCED INTO THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM IN 1943, AND SUBSEQUENTLY INSERVICE AND SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PROGRAMS IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS WERE INITIATED. SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES AND VARIOUS COMMITTEES HAVE FURTHERED THE HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAMS. (NH)

ED020951
T5103457
C0771 c:2

D 00771

FOR EVERY CHILD

The Story of

INTEGRATION IN THE PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Board of Public Education

Leon J. Obermayer, President

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

October 1960

UD 000 771

FOR EVERY CHILD

The Story of

INTEGRATION IN THE PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Board of Public Education

Leon J. Obermayer, President

A report of the Philadelphia Public Schools issued many years ago carried this statement: "The aim of our schools is to provide for every child, rich or poor, strong or weak, brilliant or slow, academic-minded or hand-minded as broad an education and as much education as his or her capacity will permit."

All of this statement is of great significance. However, it is important just now that the words every child be given special attention. As far as can be ascertained, at no time in this century has any child been deprived of the privilege of attending any Philadelphia public school because of his or her race, religion, or national background.

Although in this report there will be many references to those activities which relate to the development of active goodwill and understanding among those of different religious faiths or different national origin, the matter of racial integration will be given special consideration.

The percentage of Negro pupils in our schools in 1915 was 5%; in 1945 it was 26%. The percentages at the several grade levels in recent years follow:

	1957	1958	1959	1960
Elementary	45	47	49	51
Jr. High	39	41	42	45
Sr. High	30	30	31	32
Technical High	34	37	40	43
Over-all	41	43	45	47

There are about 5000 Puerto Rican children.

It may be interesting to compare the above figures with those from two of our sister cities.

In Washington, D. C. the percentage for Negro pupils in 1949 was 48.4; in 1953, 56.8; in 1958, 74.1.

On page six of the June 1960 New York report, "Toward Greater Opportunity," is this statement:

"No one can fail to be impressed with the scope and magnitude of our efforts. Yet, what we have done is indeed small, compared with what remains to be done. Studies of population trends indicate that by 1980 our city Negro and Puerto Rican population will have grown from 1,650,000 to approximately 2,500,000. Today, three-quarters of the public elementary school children in Manhattan are either Negro or Puerto Rican; for the city as a whole, the figure is two in five. The quality of education received by these children will determine, in large measure, the extent to which they can make their maximum contributions to our city, to our community, and to our country."

A half century ago, most of the Negro pupils in Philadelphia were in a limited number of schools. At present, including annexes, there are in the system 262 public school buildings. In 175 or approximately 67% there are integrated student bodies, (Central High School - 6%; Girls High School - 16%). In each of another 38 (14%) the Negro population is 99+%. In each of still another 49 (19%) it is 0%.

Washington has 18 all white schools, and 68 which are 99+% Negro.

In New York City 75 elementary schools or 13.2% of all elementary schools have Negro or Puerto Rican enrollments ranging from 90 to 100%.

The reason for what has been called by certain groups "de facto segregation" in some schools has not been the result of policy of The Board of Public Education. It has been and is the policy of the Board to determine school boundaries on the bases of school populations in relation to building capacities, distances between homes and schools, and unusual traffic hazards. The boundaries are not based on ethnic or religious factors.

WHERE THE PUPILS LIVE AND GO TO SCHOOL

Boundary plans are available for public examination; those for an individual school in the principal's office; for the schools in a district -- in the district superintendent's office; for all schools -- in the office of the Division of Educational Research. Boundaries are prepared by the district superintendent and principal on the bases cited above.

The New York Survey has this to say: "It is not easy to balance zoning principles against each other, to consider dozens of other variables, and at the same time keep the public happy in drawing school district lines. To suggest that these lines be drawn to consider the possibility for integration is to make more difficult that which is already too difficult."

In the New York Progress Report of June, 1960, "Toward Greater Opportunity," Col. Arthur Levitt, Co-Chairman of The New York City Board of Education, Commission on Integration, had this to say: "All of the attempts

of the Board of Education artificially to integrate schools by adjusting district lines end up as puny efforts in the face of this pattern of residential segregation. Unless, and until, these social attitudes are changed the integrated school population, which should be our goal, will remain impossible."

It might be well at this point to note that the record of progress of the Philadelphia Public Schools in the integration movement is among the best, if not the best, of those of the great cities of the Nation. It should be noted that it is the Philadelphia policy to have each child, unless his physical, mental or other educational needs require assignment to specially organized classes and schools, attend the school serving his community. However, as has always been the practice, a parent may request the assignment of his child, regardless of what his race or creed may be, to any public school having appropriate grades or courses, provided that that school after enrolling the children of its community has adequate accommodations for pupils from outside. In Philadelphia only 5,000 pupils, approximately, out of 245,000 are attending schools outside their home boundaries and the majority of these are Negro children.

It has been stated that the maintenance of open boundaries for some schools and the long-standing rule of optional enrollment at such schools interfere with the integration process. In a limited number of cases this may be true. In all probability, the converse is true in most cases and to a much greater degree. It has been demonstrated in other urban centers where closed boundaries for all schools were the rule, parents not yet sympathetic to integration have sent their children to private schools or have moved from the community. Problems relating to integration do not begin in the school but rather in the changing community.

The freedom of choice is available in other cities. It is generally used because of reasons other than those related to integration. It permits a flexibility which is often essential to individual adjustments. Too frequently, when it is denied, it leads to the falsification of addresses, the employment of pressures, and the deliberate confusing of boundary issues. Washington permits such transfers on the basis of eight exceptions. New York City has just modified its program in this direction.

WHAT THE PUPILS STUDY

The Philadelphia Public Schools recognize every child as a unique individual with strengths and weaknesses, with needs to be met, with potentialities to be developed. For these reasons, the schools, for many years, have embraced a philosophy of individualization of instruction and have done everything possible, with the means available, to implement that philosophy. The program has been eminently successful; on the other hand, continuing effort is being made to further increase its effectiveness. The program provides methods for determining the student's capabilities; instruction of the child apart from others in his class under certain circumstances; grouping based on achievement for instruction in a number of elementary subject fields; enrichment programs; a wide range of subjects at the secondary level; courses for "average", "slow moving", "bright", and "advanced standing" students at the

secondary level; remedial instruction; evaluation programs; and other devices. This philosophy and these methods are employed in every school on the basis of student needs without regard to racial or religious background.

Courses of study, known as curriculum guides, are standard for the city. However, teachers and administrators, on the basis of their knowledge of the students gained through testing programs, observation, and other sources, make adjustments through variations in rates of required progress or subject matter content.

In the report on "The Status of the Public School Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City" (Public Education Association - October 1955) treatment is given the question of whether the achievement in X schools (predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican) is the same as in Y schools (predominantly white). The point is made that in reading and arithmetic it is not. Other subjects were not tested. The New York school system suggests that X children do not test as high in general ability, but the experts insist that the tests of general ability merely reflect what has been learned. They say that the fact that a child does not do well in a general ability test might in itself be a symptom of instructional weakness.

Our Philadelphia schools use verbal or general ability tests for ascertaining IQ's. However, these serve only as a general indication of ability and the classroom teacher bases his instructional procedures and content upon the actual accomplishments of the child in daily recitations, in tests, and in other activities or attitudes which the teacher observes. To say that subject matter achievement in an X type of school is lower than in a Y because of instructional weakness is to make the teacher the cause. Actually, the qualifications of our teachers, their earnestness, their efforts to help pupils achieve the best possible results, are of the same high standard in all schools.

THE TEACHERS

This brings us to the subject of teachers and other adult personnel.

Many years have passed since separate eligible lists based on race were abolished. All employes are treated equally in the matters of appointment and transfer. These arrangements are governed by established regulations. The candidates are called in order of standing on the eligible list. Preliminary to appointment each candidate reports to the office of an associate superintendent for a conference. In making assignments the associate superintendent takes into consideration the following:

1. Wherever possible, the location of the person's home in relation to the school location.

2. The transfer policy with its ratio of two transfers to one new appointment and with seniority rights. This policy has been approved by teacher groups.

3. The possibility of enhancing the integration program.

4. The question of where the teacher might render the best service to the school and the community. There must be some flexibility in this regard.

Sometimes candidates refuse assignments. It is argued that new teachers should be dropped from the list if they refuse to accept assignments. Names are passed over in the case of refusal but they are retained on the lists and the persons generally accept other assignments later. We are presently operating in a "teacher's market" and no school system can afford to drop teachers from lists if vacancies exist anywhere.

Some personnel statistics follow:

		Number of Schools with No Negro Personnel		
	Total	1957	1959	1960
Senior high	18	4	4	3
Technical high	3	0	0	0
Junior high	27	6	3	2
Elementary	198	102	86	84
	246	112	93	89

Certain Categories

1960 Principals

	Negro	White
Senior high	1	17
Technical high	0	3
Junior high	2	24
Elementary	16	182
	19	226

1960 Vice Principals

Senior high		30
Technical high		6
Junior high	3	40
	3	76

1960 Teachers

Senior high	125	1,519
Technical high	19	213
Junior high	448	1,068
Elementary	1,570	2,833
	2,162	5,633

For Insertion on Page Five Following the Tenth Line Which Ends

"if vacancies exist anywhere"

Again, it must be pointed out that the Philadelphia situation is similar to that of the other great cities of the nation. For example, the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations in its May 1960 recommendations for the Governor's Committee on Education had this to say:

> "In schools which were 80% or more Negro in enrollment as compared to schools with less than 25% Negro enrollment, there was a higher proportion of classes for the mentally limited than of classes for the mentally superior, there was a higher rate of teacher turnover, there was a greater use of substitute teachers, and there was a greater tendency for children to drop out of high school and less of a tendency to attend college."

1960 Counselors or Counseling Teachers

	Negro	White
Senior high	9	61
Technical high	1	10
Junior high	12	69
Elementary	32	105
	54	245

Substitute Teachers

	894	1,754

1960 Secretaries

Senior high	2	95
Technical high	1	14
Junior high	13	94
Elementary	30	211
	46	414

1960 Positions in Administrative Offices
(Superintendents, Directors, Supervisors, Secretaries, et al)

	120	983

1960 Evening Schools

	174	954

1960 Total Instructional Personnel

Senior and Technical high	170		2,161
Junior high	484		1,315
Elementary	1,660		3,360
Administrative	120		983
Total	2,434		7,819
Grand Total		10,253	
	24%		76%

THE BOOKS AND SUPPLIES

It is the policy of The Board of Public Education to provide supplies and equipment on the basis of instructional program needs and the general welfare of all the children without regard to race or creed. The money allotments for books and supplies are standard.

The 1959 figures on average school expenditures per pupil were:

Elementary	278.30
Junior high	374.71
Senior high	407.78
Technical high	542.38
Total	323.88

THE SCHOOL BUILDINGS

It is the policy of The Board of Public Education to construct new buildings and to make additions and alterations where increases in population or changes in program make them necessary, and to keep all buildings in good condition -- to do these without regard to the ethnic or religious nature of the school population.

In the areas where Negro children are in the majority 17 new schools have been constructed and 20 have been reconstructed or have received additions since 1946. The cost has been in excess of $37,000,000, as compared with construction costing approximately $50,000,000 in all other parts of the City including wide new areas in which no schools had existed. Others are in the planning stage or under construction.

Construction dates of buildings built before 1946 which now have 90% or more non-white enrollments are as follow:

William Penn High	1908	Meade	1954 (1936)
Barratt Jr. High	1926	Peirce	1928
Fitzsimons Jr. High	1926	Reynolds	1925
Fleisher Jr. High	1925	Smith	1954 (1924)
Stoddart	1892	Stanton, E. M.	1925
Sulzberger Jr. High	1923	Burk	1904
Vaux Jr. High	1936	Hancock	1902
Barry	1908	Hawthorne	1907
Belmont	1927	Meredith	1930
Brooks	1918	Paxson	1928
Kendrick	1905	Spring Garden	1927
Dunlap	1905	Wister	1925
Holmes	1950 (1916)	Allison	1897
McMichael (Plans under way)	1924 (1890)	Claghorn	1883 (1950)
Martha Washington	1955 (1929)	Cleveland	1908
Carver	1948	Hanna	1908
Childs	1928 (1893)	Arnold	1904
Douglass	1950 (1939)	Dunbar	1931
Singerly	1890	Elverson	1929
Durham	1909	Harrison	1928
Arthur (Plans under way)	1886	Widener, J. H.	1899
Kane (Plans under way)	1880	Hill	1921 (1843)
Kelley	1890	Keyser (Renovated 1958)	1887
Landreth	1923 (1889)	Kenderton (Plans under way)	1907

This pattern is typical for the system as a whole.

EDUCATION IN HUMAN RELATIONS

The improvement of human relations has been an important concern of many persons in the Philadelphia Public Schools for 20 years. Long before an organized program had developed for the school system, individual teachers, principals, and faculty groups engaged in activities and projects which attempted to foster better human relations. A general climate of good will and cooperation was already present at the time that organized human relations emphases began to pervade the work of the schools in 1943. The schools' program evolved from an existing background of experience, and a developed belief in a concept that human relations education was an important part of education rather than a need growing from emergency tension situations alone.

As early as 1943, the Superintendent of Schools led the way for the development of a comprehensive program in human relations. That year he appointed an assistant to give particular attention to the areas of race relations and inter-group tensions. In 1944, a "Committee on Living Together" was formed by the Superintendent to survey the schools so that good existing human relations practices could be brought together and shared. At the same time, the Associate Superintendent in charge of Curriculum and Teacher Education was engaged in extending intergroup understanding through the work of his office.

The activities of the Curriculum Office, the "Living Together Committee" and the Assistant to the Superintendent brought the schools into direct relationship with many intergroup agencies in Philadelphia. Special seminars and study-action committees grew from this working partnership.

One of the first seminars organized, the "Intercultural Leadership Seminar," brought together community leaders and those persons in administrative positions who had important responsibilities for school practices and policies. The "Intercultural Leadership Seminar" met monthly over a four year period and assisted greatly in keeping those in positions of responsibility, both in the schools and in the community, acquainted with developments in the field of intergroup relations.

Subsequent seminars were planned in which personnel from the Philadelphia school system participated. A seminar on the "Emotional Needs of Children" was conducted for parents, teachers, administrators, and community leaders. Another was organized for principals and involved heads of over one hundred schools for a two-year period. School supervisors also had a special seminar experience planned for them.

The need to discuss ways of reducing and preventing school and community intergroup incidents stimulated the formation of a "Committee on Community Tensions." Representatives of the schools, civic, governmental, and intergroup agencies met each month as members of this committee, and were markedly successful in accomplishing their purposes.

The "Committee on Living Together" visited schools - talked to teachers, school counselors, nurses, and principals; conducted several conferences for school personnel; and sought the advice of experts in the intergroup relations field. Their findings and recommendations were organized in a comprehensive report published in 1951 by the Philadelphia Schools' Curriculum Office under the title, "IMPROVING HUMAN RELATIONS." Activities outlined in it have been and are carried on in the following areas:

1. In-Service Education - Courses are offered to teachers during after-school hours and are designed to help them gain competence in planning classroom activities and study-units on human relations topics.

2. Philadelphia Public Schools' Summer Workshop - Consultant service is made available for teachers who wish to work on human relations problems.

3. Textbook Requisition Lists - Books are scrutinized for stereotypes or prejudicial points of view. Conversely, books which contribute to better understanding are added to existing lists.

4. Curriculum Planning and Revision - Human Relations emphases are incorporated in appropriate teaching guides and courses of study.

Revisions of courses and guides used in the schools today bear evidence of the constructive work which curriculum planning committees give to human relations. For instance, the social studies guides present specific suggestions to teachers regarding aims, units of study, procedures, and teaching aids. In the recently published guide, "Social Studies in the Elementary Schools," (September 1956, Curriculum Office) the very first objective mentioned reflects the Philadelphia School System's attitude toward human relations education. "The ability to get along with other people" is implemented at all grade levels with several suggested units of study. In grade one, there is a unit on "Making New Friends"; grade two, "Let's Be Good Neighbors"; grade three, "Many Helpers Work to Build Our Homes"; grade four, "Friendly Neighbors Live in Our City and State"; grade five, "Many Faiths - Many Backgrounds - All Americans"; and grade six, "The Cultural Gifts of Our World Neighbors." Other human relations objectives such as "the recognition of the common elements in all cultures" and "The Awareness of Public Issues and Problems" are stated in the same elementary social studies guide, and similarly implemented through units of study at each grade level.

At the secondary school level, the "American History and Government Course of Study" (Curriculum Office, 1954) offers topics for study such as the "Maintenance of Good Intercultural Relations," the "Importance of Our Basic Human Rights," and "Role of Government in Maintaining and Increasing Human Rights."

Two significant research studies were undertaken in the Philadelphia Public Schools soon after the end of the Second World War - "The Open-mindedness Study" and "The Philadelphia Early Childhood Project."

In 1946, a distinguished citizen of Philadelphia, the late Samuel S. Fels, offered to provide financial assistance to the schools for a study of factors which cause people to become close-minded. Teachers and principals from schools located in every section of the city participated in the study. "Toward the Open Mind," published in 1951 by the Curriculum Office, was an outgrowth of this study and suggests school activities which can help to overcome the kind of thinking which results in prejudice.

"The Philadelphia Early Childhood Project" was also initiated in 1946. Support for this study came from the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission. The project was designed as a field experiment in intercultural education to discover the sources of prejudice in very young children. Fifteen teachers from five elementary schools were selected to engage in the experiment. Children in kindergarten to second grade participated with these teachers. In addition to the Fellowship Commission, guidance for the study was provided by the Bureau of Intercultural Education at New York University and the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. A full report of the study, "They Learn What They Live," by Helen G. Trager and Marian R. Yarrow, was published in 1952 by Harper and Brothers.

As an outgrowth of the "Early Childhood Project," the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission sponsored a seminar plan with the Philadelphia Public Schools to apply these findings, and those of later research, to the development of an on-going city-wide program of intergroup education. Since 1953, a total of 38 elementary schools and five junior high schools participated in these seminars. Each school has been represented by a team, consisting of two teachers, two parents, and the principal. Nine workshop sessions have been conducted each school year at which the teams - usually seven or eight - have met with Dr. H. Harry Giles, of New York University, who served as consultant. Each school team selected an area of concentration and outlined an experimental corrective program. Every project undertaken contributed to the improvement of teaching, the understanding of children, and the solution of community problems. Staff relations, staff and pupils relations, pupil-pupil relations, and school-community relations were involved. Members of the teams were made aware of racial, economic, and ethnic issues on the national level.

A change in title and broadening of emphasis now has been given to the Childhood Relations Seminar so that individual schools may participate in a situation of importance and significance to the school system as a whole - one to which all contributing schools could supply some answers to the problems presented. The project now is called the "Action-Research Seminar on Intergroup Education" and is concerned this year (1959-1960) with the problem:

"How can a school help its young people to know and work with others of the many racial, religious, and thenic groups they meet as they move through the school system and live in the heterogeneous community of Philadelphia?"

Current Activities - School Year 1959-1960

In-Service Education Programs

A. A five-week Seminar on Human Relations has been conducted each summer for the past five years. The purpose of this seminar is to provide teachers with practical suggestions for the development of good human relations and with guidance in meeting real intergroup problems.

B. Other In-Service seminars, workshops, or programs: Facts the History Book Forgot, Inquiry, Africa Speaks, Penn's Woods - Penn's People - Penn's Peace, History from Fellowship Hilltop, Weekend Work Camp, New Lives for Old, Incident Control, Talk Around - Seminar in Intergroup Relations, The American Dilemma, Understanding Our Newest Neighbors.

C. The presentation of a new publication, "A Survey of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Philadelphia Public Elementary Schools" at a meeting held in cooperation with Fellowship House.

Activities Involving School-Intergroup Agency Cooperation

A. Fellowship Commission

The Fellowship Commission, and the Philadelphia Public Schools, have sponsored and conducted the following programs and seminars:

1. Childhood Relations Seminar
2. Action-Research Seminar in Intergroup Education
3. Junior High School Seminar in Human Relations
4. Seminar on Emotional Needs of Children
5. Intercultural Leadership Seminar
6. Administrative Problems in Human Relations
7. Human Relations Leadership Seminar
8. Human Relations Seminar for Supervisors and Directors
9. Traveling Libraries

B. Fellowship House

1. Fellowship Clubs - in secondary schools
2. Arrow Program - in elementary schools
3. Doll Collection - for elementary schools

C. National Conference of Christians and Jews

1. Junior High School Human Relations Conference
2. High School Editors' Conference - "You - Your School Paper - and Human Relations"
3. Teacher scholarships for summer workshops at Penn State, Rutgers, and other colleges and universities

D. Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith

Provides materials, films, booklets, and speakers for schools

E. Urban League - Vocational Guidance programs

F. Commission on Human Relations

This municipal agency supplies speakers and materials for use in schools. Joint conferences are held by the representatives of the Commission on Human Relations and the Superintendent and his staff on human relations problems in the City of Philadelphia which affect the schools and the communities they serve.

Special Guidance Programs

A. Project Wings

An effort at William Penn High School to discover talent, intellectual and otherwise. This project, conducted in a high school serving culturally deprived girls, aims to:

1. Develop talent by enrichment of curriculum, and by attempting to overcome the handicaps resulting from under-education and a culturally impoverished background.

2. Make the educational process exciting and desirable to adolescents who have often been classified as slow learners.

3. To attempt through improved testing and skillful counseling to determine the blocks and barriers to learning and to help the pupils raise their level of aspiration.

Special Services in the Schools Which Have Helped in the Integration Process

Counseling, (164 counselors in high school; 135 counseling teachers in elementary), reading clinic, reading centers, special classes, speech teachers, reading adjustment teachers, remedial reading classes, increased teacher allotment in certain junior and senior high schools (54 in junior high schools; 68 in senior high schools), psychological service, psychiatric service, medical and health services, adaptation of curricula and curricular materials, homemaking consultants, child care center program, work-study program, adult education and school extension program and in-service program for teachers.

Ford Foundation Project

Title: The School-Community Co-ordinating Team

This project proposes to concentrate on the improvement of educational standards among culturally deprived pupils. It will attempt to do so through a team approach in order to bring about realistic and mutually beneficial working relationships between the teacher, the child, and the parent.

Schools Committee for Human Relations

A. Organized in 1956.

B. Responsible for co-ordinating and extending the human relations efforts of the schools.

C. Representatives appointed to the committee by school district superintendents.

D. Meets monthly. The members bring problems and needs in human relations to the committee for consideration.

E. Committee is guided by following objectives:

1. Continue the task of sensitizing persons in the school system to improve human relations.

2. Foster experimentation by faculty groups in individual schools.

3. Encourage interschool sharing of practices that have resulted in successful intergroup projects and programs.

4. Stimulate increased school use of community resources and intergroup agencies when planning to meet the educational needs of classroom groups.

5. Enlist parent and community understanding and support of the schools' human relations program.

F. At present the committee is attempting to work on the following three human relations problems:

1. One subcommittee is exploring the possibility of providing special services for in-migrant newcomers.

2. Another subcommittee is preparing material consisting of helpful suggestions to school personnel in "changing community" situations.

3. A third group is preparing specific technique suggestions which hold promise of improving the teachers' competence in meeting intergroup problems.

Co-ordinator for Human Relations

A. School Service

1. Demonstrates human relations education techniques.

2. Speaks at faculty meetings.

3. Participates in human relations assembly programs.

4. Arranges for participation of intergroup personnel in school activities.

5. Assists teacher planning groups in organizing human relations programs, etc.

B. Committee Responsibility

1. Chairman of Schools Committee for Human Relations

2. Associate Chairman of Action-Research Seminar in Intergroup Education (conducted co-operatively by Philadelphia Public Schools and Fellowship Commission.)

3. Committee on Community Tensions.

4. Junior High School Fellowship Conference.

5. Education Committee - National Conference of Christians and Jews.

6. Committee on Puerto Rican Pupils.

7. Leader of In-Service Courses.

C. Community Contacts

1. Interprets the schools' human relations program to home and school associations, to intergroup agencies, and to civic and community organizations.

2. Maintains close liaison with local intergroup agencies.

3. Assists in special program requests of intergroup agencies.

D. Tension Problems

1. "Trouble shooting" work in cooperation with Anti-Defamation League, Commission on Human Relations, Jewish Community Relations Council, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, and American Jewish Congress.

2. Assists the principal and staff members of individual schools.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION, July 8, 1959

WHEREAS the Board of Public Education seeks to provide the best education possible for all children; and

WHEREAS, the Educational Equality League and other organizations have requested the adoption of written policies for full interracial integration of pupils and teachers:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the official policy of The Board of Public Education, School District of Philadelphia, continues to be that there shall be no discrimination because of race, color, religion or national origin in the placement, instruction and guidance of pupils; the employment assignment, training and promotion of personnel; the provision and maintenance of physical facilities, supplies and equipment, the development and implementation of the curriculum including the activities program; and in all other matters relating to the administration and supervision of the public schools and all policies related thereto; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that notice of this resolution be given to all personnel.

THE PARENTS

Dr. Eli Ginzberg in his important volume, "The Challenge of the Negro Potential," points out that "the prevailing view among social scientists holds that there are no significant differences among groups as to the distribution of innate aptitudes, or at most very slight differences. On the other hand, differences among individuals are very substantial. The extent to which an individual is able to develop his attitudes will depend largely upon the circumstances present in the family within which he grows up and the opportunities which he encounters at school and in the larger community." Dr. Ginzberg also states, "The school and the home always stand in reciprocal relationship to each other. When children first enter school, there are great differences in their ability to profit from it, resulting in large part from their pre-school experiences. The child who begins school with a meager store of facts about the world around him, with a limited vocabulary, with no sense of the pleasures to be found in learning, is under a handicap that he is never likely to fully overcome. It is next to impossible, even for a skillful teacher,

to stimulate students to develop their latent potential unless parents take a positive or at least neutral attitude toward the schooling process... It is not easy for a child to respond enthusiastically to school when there is nothing in his home or community environment to feed the interests that have been awakened."

IN CONCLUSION

Again, let it be said that the schools must always be on the alert to find better ways of teaching, more effective counseling procedures, and better adjustment of the school program to meet every student's physical, moral, educational, vocational, and avocational needs. However, there is no evidence to indicate that any groups have been discriminated against or been given inadequate attention in connection with the instructional program. If more children of one group proportionately are in special classes, it is not because those children have been given poor instruction but because of the environmental factors mentioned above. If fewer have been enrolled in the "academic" classes of higher schools, the reason is much the same. Encouragement, motivation, sympathy stemming from improved homes, communities, and schools can eventually solve these problems.

It would be well if all individuals and groups would refrain from talking about intolerance, prejudice, and bigotry. The solution to our problems lies in working, playing, living side by side and in striving for active good will and understanding in order that there may be education, success, and happiness FOR EVERY CHILD.

October 1960